

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-15, and 37-61 are now pending in the application with claims 1-4, 7-9, and 37-58 having previously been withdrawn. Applicant notes that claims 59-61 were added to the application but not addressed in the Office Action. Therefore, applicant requests that a new Office Action be issued which addresses these claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner has withdrawn claims 11 and 15 under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The “certificate issuance unit (certificate validity checking unit)” shown in FIG. 3 which is pointed out by the Examiner as the representative element of Species 2 is one of the elements included in the “session control server 101.” FIG. 9 illustrates the operations performed by the “session control server 101” and claims 11 and 15 are directed also to the operations performed by the “session control server 101.” Thus, claims 11 and 15 belong to Species 2 and should not be withdrawn from the application. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration of the withdrawal of this election.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holmes (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0116610; “Holmes”). Claims 10 and 14 stand rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes in view of Ono (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0035685; “Ono”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that all of the features recited in claim 5 are disclosed in Holmes. The Examiner also asserts that the feature “issuing the public key certificate...” recited in claims 10 and 14 is disclosed in Ono, and that the other features recited in claims 10 and 14 are disclosed in Holmes.

However, neither Holmes nor Ono discloses “a storing unit that stores the address information and the public key certificate with a validity period of the address information being set to that of the public key certificate” recited in claim 5 and the similar feature of “storing” recited in claims 10 and 14. Paragraph [0031] of Holmes pointed out by the Examiner discloses that “the database stores a list of authorized/valid digital certificates, and optionally a list of invalid certificates,” but does not disclose a validity period of the certificates. Additionally, lines 14-18, paragraph [0035], of Holmes disclose that “a validity field specifying the period of validity of the digital certificate, a version field, etc. are included in the Basic Certificate,” but does not disclose that the validity date of the digital certificate is set to be that of address information.

Further, paragraph [0045] of Holmes discloses that “the recipient computer system 130 receives or loads the object 610, digital certificate 635, and Working Certificate 500, which may be stored on mass storage 940,” but does not disclose a validity period of “the digital certificate 635.” Compared to the relationship between the “server” and the “communication device” of the present invention, the “recipient computer 130” of Holmes corresponds to the “communication device” of the present invention, and therefore has nothing to do with the feature of the “storing unit” included

in the “server.”

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 6, and claims 10 and 14, define patentable subject matter over Holmes, and the combination of Holmes and Ono, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2009

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/dec